

REMARKS

The office action that was mailed August 5, 2008, rejected all pending claims 1-35. Applicants have amended claims each of independent claims 1, 18, and 19 to more particularly define the subject matter sought to be patented, and have amended dependent claims 8, 15, 26 and 33 for consistency with the independent claims. Applicants have also added new claims 36-37, and have canceled without prejudice claims 5-7, 14, 23-25, and 32. The amendments add no new matter, and are fully supported by the original specification (e.g., at FIGS. 4-7, at page 11, line 1 through page 19, line 2, and at the original claims). Claims 1-4, 8-13, 15-22, 26-31, and 33-37 are pending, and Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended each of independent claims 1 and 18 to recite “a computer-implemented method.” Applicants submit that each of claims 1-4, 8-13, and 15-18 is directed to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the non-statutory subject matter rejections of these claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 3-23, 14-19, 21-30, and 32-35 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,668,253 to Thompson et al. (“Thompson”). Of these, claims 1, 18 and 19 are independent.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that the method includes “providing a repository of business database objects,” “receiving a user selection of one of the business database objects, . . . and displaying a view of the one or more attributes associated with the selected business object,” “displaying, within the view, a plurality of business objects each having associated attributes, wherein each of the business objects has a defined relationship to the selected business object, and displaying within the view at least some of the attributes for the

plurality of related business objects,” “receiving a user selection of at least one of the displayed one or more attributes associated with the selected business object, and a user selection of at least one of the displayed attributes for the plurality of related business objects, and adding the selected attributes to a business content structure of selected attributes,” and “executing a query of records in a database and retrieving, for each of the records that meet the query, attribute data for each of the attributes in the business content structure.” The amendment adds no new matter.

Thompson discloses a system for enterprise information management. *See* col. 1, lines 13-15. A user viewing a report may right-click on a data element and drill down to a lower level of detail via predefined “drill paths.” *See* col. 8, lines 54-59; col. 10, lines 53-62; Fig. 6.

Claim 1 is patentable over Thompson because Thompson fails to disclose or suggest a method that includes displaying a view that includes a selected business database object and one or more attributes associated with the selected business object, as well as a plurality of business objects having a defined relationship to the selected business object, and at least some of the attributes for the plurality of related business objects, receiving a user selection of at least one of the displayed one or more attributes associated with the selected business object, and at least one of the displayed attributes for the plurality of related business objects, and adding the selected attributes to a business content structure of selected attributes. With implementations of the claim 1 method, a user may, for example, select a business database object and conveniently view, for selection, attributes not only of the selected object, but also of related database objects, all within a single view, and may select an attribute of the selected business object and an attribute of a related business object so that a query may be executed and data may be retrieved for use in report generation. *See* Applicants' specification at FIG. 4 and the corresponding discussion.

The portions of Thompson cited by the Office Action in rejecting claims 1 and 5-7 deal with modifying an existing report, as by drilling down on a particular data element in the report. In particular, the Office Action cited figures 4 and 6 from Thompson, as well as portions of the reference that describe figure 2. Figure 2 shows a group of tasks on the left side of the screen; figure 4 shows an already-generated report, and figure 6 shows a selection of “Oldsmobile” and a

pop-up window that permits the user to drill down and select either "Carline," "Model," or "Vehicle." Even if "Oldsmobile" may represent an object and "Carline," "Model," or "Vehicle" may represent selectable attributes associated with "Oldsmobile," which Applicants do not concede, Applicants submit that nowhere does Thompson disclose or suggest displaying, within the same view as the displayed selected business object and its attributes, "a plurality of business objects each having associated attributes, wherein each of the business objects has a defined relationship to the selected business object, and displaying within the view at least some of the attributes for the plurality of related business objects," as recited in claim 1, and "receiving a user selection of at least one of the displayed one or more attributes associated with the selected business object, and a user selection of at least one of the displayed attributes for the plurality of related business objects."

Neither is claim 1 obvious in view of Thompson. For example, implementations of claim 1 may provide benefits not even contemplated by Thompson, such as displaying, in a single view, a selected business object and its associated attributes, along with related business objects and at least some attributes for the related business objects such that attributes of the selected business object and the related business objects may be conveniently viewed and selected by a user for use in report generation.

For at least these reasons, amended claim 1 is patentable over Thompson, as are dependent claims 3-4, 8-13, and 15-17. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of these claims.

Independent claims 18 and 19 have been amended in similar fashion to claim 1, and are patentable over Thompson for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1, as are dependent claims 20-22, 26-31, and 33-35. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of these claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 2, 13, 20 and 31 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of various secondary references. Claims 2 and 13 depend, directly or

indirectly, from claim 1, and claims 20 and 31 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 19. As discussed above, amended claims 1 and 19 are patentable over Thompson, and the secondary references fail to cure the deficiencies of Thompson. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 19 are patentable over the cited references, whether alone or in combination, as are dependent claims 2, 13, 20 and 31, and Applicants request withdrawal of the 35 USC § 103(a) rejections of these claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that each of claims 1-4, 8-13, 15-22, 26-31, and 33-37 is in condition for immediate allowance, and request that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant : Ankur Bhatt et al.
Serial No. : 10/648,108
Filed : August 26, 2003
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-0123001/2003P00283 US01

This submission is accompanied by a Petition for a Two-month Extension of Time and the requisite fee. No other fees are believed due. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 2, 2009 _____

/Kurt F. Krenz/ _____
Kurt F. Krenz
Reg. No. 62,664

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945